

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vaughn et al. in view of Lord et al. and Claims 5 and 6 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Considering first then the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vaughn et al. in view of Lord et al., in view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 5 and 6, the claim limitations of former Claim 5 have been incorporated into Claim 1 and Claim 6 has been placed in independent form.

Applicants have, in addition, added new Claims 7-9 which correspond with the language of Claims 2-4 and have made such claims dependent directly or indirectly upon Claim 6 so as to provide the proper range of scope for protection of the invention in accordance with U.S. patent practice and procedure. It is therefore respectfully submitted that such amendments do not

Application No. 10/517,313
Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2005

raise any new issues or new considerations and instead place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421
Attorneys of Record

I:\ATTY\JDH\263385US-AM2.DOC